

REMARKS

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 99/16003 to Newman in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,860,071 to Ball, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,044,376 to Kurtzman. Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Newman in view of Ball and Kurtzman and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,710,884 to Dedrick. Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Newman in view of Ball and Kurtzman and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,035,339 to Agraharam. Claims 14-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Newman in view of Ball and Kurtzman and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,330,569 to Baisley. Claims 18-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Newman in view of Ball and Kurtzman and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,317,722 to Jacobi. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 1

The Applicant does not acknowledge that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Newman and Ball. However, assuming *arguendo* that one skilled in the art had combined the teachings of Newman and Ball, the Applicant notes that, by citing the Kurtzman reference, the Examiner acknowledges that a combination of the teachings of Newman and Ball does not teach "generating in the user's computer the code of a HTML page describing only said selected services and pushing said HTML page code into a web browser in the user's computer for permitting direct access to the services selected", as recited in claim 1.

The Applicant notes that the Examiner opines that Kurtzman discloses the above features, in particular col. 3, lines 44-50. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Applicant notes Col. 3, lines 44-50 of Kurtzman details how a user makes a request for information through a website server 110 (remote from the user's computer, see Fig. 2), and how the specific information selected and viewed by the user is

recorded by an affinity server 100 (also remote from the user, see fig. 2) as a "content stream" to be analyzed for determining which advertisement to associate to the page that will be sent to the user. The Applicant respectfully notes that the above excerpt of Kurtzman does not seem to relate to generating an HTML page code in the user's computer, and does not seem to even relate to an HTML page code that comprises only services selected by the user. The Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has failed to indicate how the information provided in Col. 3, lines 44-50 of Kurtzman read on "generating in the user's computer the code of a HTML page describing only said selected services and pushing said HTML page code into a web browser in the user's computer for permitting direct access to the services selected", as alleged by the Examiner. As such, the position of the Examiner is therefore unclear. The Examiner's statement of the grounds of rejection should be expressed in a manner that is clearly developed so as to be informative to the Applicants (see MPEP 706.7 and 707.07(d)). Should the Examiner maintain the rejection, the Applicant respectfully request that the Examiner provide a clear explanation of how each of the limitations of claim 1 read on the subject matter identified in Kurtzman as teaching the respective limitation in the next office action.

Further, the Applicant notes that Kurtzman relates to associating in the server 110 an advertisement and a new page 420 requested by the user, prior to sending the page to the user 200 (column 3, lines 64-66: "*this advertisement is sent back to the website server 110, where it is associated with the new page 420 and sent to the user 200*").

The Applicant notes that Kurtzman discloses a user computer that receives from a server 110 the sent HTML code of a requested page 420, (the page being associated in the server 110 with an advertisement provided by the server 100). The user computer of Kurtzman does not generate the page code. In this way Kurtzman requires substantial bandwidth for receiving the webpage HTML code from the server 110. Further, Kurtzman implies at least getting the requested page HTML, which impairs the privacy of the user since transmission of, for example, HTML GET requests, could potentially indirectly reveal information about the user as these GET requests could be correlated with certain identifiable attributes of the user. For example, a GET request for a

URL/content relating to a specific language or product could reveal information about the nationality or consumer preferences of the user. The Applicant notes that Kurtzman clearly teaches a system wherein the consumer preferences of the user are disclosed to the third parties running servers 110 and 100.

Conversely, claim 1 recites "generating in the user's computer the code of a HTML page describing only said selected services". Accordingly, the process recited in claim 1, because it provides for generating the HTML code in the computer:

does not request receiving a webpage HTML code, and thus request far less bandwidth than Kurtzman; and

does not request getting a webpage HTML code, and thus protects the privacy of the user against any information that could be extracted from the webpage request.

At least in view of the above, the Applicant submits that claim 1 is novel and non-obvious over Newman, in view of Ball and further in view of Kurtzman.

The Applicant also notes that Kurtzman specifically discloses associating (in server 110) the page 420 requested by the user with an advertisement selected by the affinity server 100. The advertisement, selected by the server 100, is not selected by the user. Accordingly, Kurtzman fails to teach or suggest even sending to the user a HTML page describing only said selected services, and would definitely have taught one skilled in the art away from "generating in the user's computer the code of a HTML page describing only said selected services", as recited in claim 1. For the above reason also the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is non-obvious over Newman, in view of Ball and further in view of Kurtzman.

Claim 8

The Applicant respectfully submits that the above arguments with regard to claim 1 can be used to show that Newman, Ball and Kurtzman do not suggest, alone or in combination, a computer program product as recited in claim 8 and comprising computer program code for, when executed on a computer, performing all the steps of claim 1, in particular "generating in the user's computer the code of a HTML page describing

only said selected services". The Applicant therefore submits that claim 8 is patentable over Newman in view of Ball and further in view of Kurtzman.

Claim 9

The Applicant respectfully submits that the above arguments with regard to claim 1 can be used to show that Newman, Ball and Kurtzman do not suggest, alone or in combination, an apparatus as recited in claim 9, and in particular comprising "*means for generating in the user's computer the code of a HTML page containing only said selected pieces of information*". The Applicant therefore submits that claim 9 is patentable over Newman in view of Ball and further in view of Kurtzman.

Claims 2-3, 5, 7 and 10-13

Claims 2-3, 5, 7 and 12 depend directly or indirectly on claim 1; claims 10, 11 and 13 depend directly or indirectly on claim 9. The Applicant submits that at least in view of their dependency, claims 2-3, 5, 7 and 10-13 are patentable over Newman in view of Ball and further in view of Kurtzman.

Claim 4

Claim 4 depends on claim 1. The Applicant submits that the Examiner has failed to show that Dedrick discloses or suggests a method as recited in claim 1, and in particular comprising "*generating in the user's computer the code of a HTML page describing only said selected services*", and has therefore failed to show that a combination of Newman, Ball, Kurtzman and Dedrick would disclose or suggest a method as recited in claim 1, and in particular comprising the above features. The Applicant respectfully submits that at least in view of its dependency, claim 4 is patentable over Newman in view of Ball and Kurtzman and further in view of Dedrick.

Claim 6

Claim 6 depends on claim 1. The Applicant submits that the Examiner has failed to show that Agraharam discloses or suggests a method as recited in claim 1, and in particular comprising "generating in the user's computer the code of a HTML page describing only said selected services", and has therefore failed to show that a combination of Newman, Ball, Kurtzman and Agraharam would disclose or suggest a method as recited in claim 1, and in particular comprising the above features. The Applicant submits that at least in view of its dependency, claim 6 is patentable over Newman in view of Ball and Kurtzman and further in view of Agraharam.

Claims 14-17

Claims 14-15 depend directly or indirectly on claim 1 and claims 16-17 depend directly or indirectly on claim 9. The Applicant submits that the Examiner has failed to show that Baisley discloses or suggests a method as recited in claim 1, and in particular comprising "generating in the user's computer the code of a HTML page describing only said selected services", or an apparatus as recited in claim 9, and in particular comprising "means for generating in the user's computer the code of a HTML page containing only said selected pieces of information". In view of the above, the Applicant submits that the Examiner has failed to show that a combination of Newman, Ball, Kurtzman and Baisley would disclose or suggest a method as recited in claim 1 or an apparatus as recited in claim 9, and therefore submits that claims 1 and 9 are patentable over Newman in view of Ball, Kurtzman and Baisley. The Applicant further submits that at least in view of their dependency on claims 1 or 9, claims 14-17 are patentable over that art.

Claims 18 and 19

Claim 18 depends on claim 1, and claim 19 depends on claim 9. The Applicant submits that the Examiner has failed to show that Jacobi discloses or suggests a method as recited in claim 1, and in particular comprising "generating in the user's computer the

code of a HTML page describing only said selected services", or an apparatus as recited in claim 9, and in particular comprising "means for generating in the user's computer the code of a HTML page containing only said selected pieces of information". In view of the above, the Applicant submits that the Examiner has failed to show that a combination of Newman, Ball, Kurtzman and Jacobi would disclose or suggest a method as recited in claim 1 or an apparatus as recited in claim 9, and therefore submits that claims 1 and 9 are patentable over Newman in view of Ball, Kurtzman and Jacobi. The Applicant further submits that at least in view of their dependency on claims 1 or 9, claims 18 and 19 are patentable over that art.

* * *

In view of the above, the Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance and respectfully urge the Examiner to pass this case to issue.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 08-2025. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 08-2025.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Post Office with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on


January 30, 2006
(Date of Transmission)

Shannon Tinsley
(Name of Person Transmitting)


(Signature)

1/30/06
(Date)

Respectfully submitted,


Richard P. Berg
Attorney for the Applicant
Reg. No. 28,145
LADAS & PARRY
5670 Wilshire Boulevard,
Suite 2100
Los Angeles, California 90036
(323) 934-2300 voice
(323) 934-0202 facsimile